DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 098 127 SO 007 915

AUTHOR Hanley, Janet; And Others
TITLE National Humanities Faculty Working Papers.[Six Papers Concerned with Development of Humanities Curricula.]
INSTITUTION National Humanities Faculty, Concord, Mass.
PUB DATE 72
NOTE 57p.; Related documents are SO 007 914-918

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Course Objectives; *Curriculum Development; *Curriculum Enrichment; Educational Environment; Educational Objectives; *Humanities Instruction; Intellectual Disciplines; *Program Design; Program Development; Resource Units; Secondary Education; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Developed Materials; Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

The National Humanities Faculty working papers collected in this document consider the process of curriculum development and approaches in curriculum presentation. Janet Hanley's "Success or Failure in Curriculum Development: Six Ways to Know" provides a set of review questions for curriculum developers to help insure a successful course. A. D. Van Nostrand's description of the "portable module" includes the mechanics for an idea to enrich an ongoing course. Hyman Kavett emphasizes the importance of teachers' enthusiasm, willingness to make bold decisions, and ability to cooperate with other teaching colleagues in curriculum development. Frithjof Bergmann's report on a visit to the Berea Community School in Kentucky justifies a program emphasizing respect for the individual student's development and initiative. David Tyack's paper "Ask Yourself About the Humanities," is a set of questions for private pondering and public discussion in the preparation of a humanities curriculum. John Ratte's report of several days of brainstorming on the development of a humanities curriculum to examine values, culture, and their interrelationship reveals the nature of the development process. (JH)

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Rosenblatt, Hanley
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 098127

NATIONAL HUMANITIES FACULTY WORKING PAPERS. [SIX PAPERS CONCERNED WITH DEVELOPMENT OF HUMANITIES CURRICULA.]

BY JANET HANLEY AND OTHERS

SP 008 915

ED 076177

THE NATIONAL HUMANITIES FACULTY, 1266 MAIN STREET, CONCORD, MASSACHUSETTS 01742 / (617) 369-7800

NHF WORKING PAPERS

D-101

Mrs. Janet Hanley, Program Evaluator, NHF, and Director of Evaluation, Education Development Center, prepared thi questionnaire, SUCCESS OR FAILURE IN CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT: SIX WAYS TO KNOW, for anyone assessing progress and change in subject matter presentation. It can be used during early planning, in midcourse, at the end of the project, or all three.

(c) 1972 by Education Development Center

SPONSORED BY PHI BETA KAPPA
THE AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES AND THE AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

"Wow! The agony!" - a young teacher reacting to the creation of a new course after she had sat through a working session with the developer.

She has a point. Curriculum development is a difficult business.

What seems to make the difference between success and failure? With all the energy and intelligence that go into this process, why are closetsful of materials developed that don't live long enough to see the light of a classroom day?

This booklet has been prepared for anyone intrigued by these problems.

The questions that follow may seem painfully obvious to those who have developed new courses of study. We hope so. We also hope you'll give them a try as organizers for a review of your work.

More is known about this process of development than we sometimes think, and we shouldn't have to reinvent our own wheel!

1. BEGINNING QUESTIONS

Do you personally find the themes, materials, activities of your course intrinsically "interesting"?

YES____ NO____

Cite an example of what for you is:

an important idea

an exciting piece of material

a provocative activity

Is your enthusiasm for the above items shared by other people?

YES____ NO____ DON'T KNOW____

ITEM: It has been demonstrated that material which failed to generate initial enthusiasm and involvement has usually fallen flat on its binders. The early, honest reactions of staff members and collaborating teachers have been reliable indicators of later student and teacher reactions.

2. QUESTIONS ABOUT GOALS

What are the assumptions, the "world view," of your program?

Are these assumptions identified as such for students, other teachers, and administrators?

YES____ NO____

Why is it important for people to perceive the world from this point of view?

What are your goals?

What concepts or themes do you want students and other teachers to understand and use?

What kinds of skills do you want to develop? (For example, use of evidence, ability to express ideas in writing.)

What forms of social learning do you want to encourage? (For example, sharing knowledge, working in groups, communicating with others.)

What can the materials contribute to the present and future satisfaction of students and teachers?

What is the primary reason you personally want students to have the experience of this program?

3. QUESTIONS ABOUT QUESTIONS

One of the most powerful ways to set a framework for your course is to develop organizing questions or themes. What are the organizing questions or themes of your program?

ITEM: These questions should be made clear not only to teachers but also to students. If they are not, frequently they are like dinosaurs, doomed to extinction. Check your student materials to be sure the central questions are prominent.

Is there a clear relationship between the organizing questions and the materials and activities used to explore these questions?

YES____ NO____

If yes, illustrate with three examples.

Do you have a personal answer of your own to the central questions?

YES____ NO___

(If not -- return to GO, page 1. Do not collect your next pay check.)

Does the course raise questions which students should be able to answer with some degree of closure?

YES____ NO____

If yes, cite examples.

Does the course raise questions which are truly open-ended?

YES____ NO____

If yes, cite examples.

If this distinction exists, has it been clarified for students and teachers?

YES____ NO____

4. QUESTIONS ABOUT LEARNING STYLES

ITEM: It is important to consider the stages of the human lifetime in developing your program. Some guidelines:

Middle Childhood: attributes of developing social maturity in the form of cooperative behavior and regard for others; new intellectual skills oriented more toward concrete and specific operations than abstract thinking, but revolving around growing language facility and pleasure in communication; industriousness and seriousness toward tasks; need for creative and imaginative expressions. Children need help in techniques of working together, sharing ideas verbally and through projects and activities, and using specific information to build toward more general ideas.

Adolescence: natural propensities for theorizing (as Piaget put it, the time when "thoughts take wing"); searching out personal identity, striving for competence, acute self-consciousness and "self" centeredness. Students need help in learning how to turn wild speculation into informed conjecture and realistic conclusion; and opportunities to put themselves "in the place of" others -- to share others' lives -- and to use their energy in responsible tasks both in and out of the classroom.

Adulthood: a stage in the life cycle that Erikson has characterized as a time to be of service, to cultivate growth in the young, to be "wise"; for teachers, this has special implications for developing in relations with students the concept of mutuality. Teachers need help in extending their knowledge about their own possible roles as adults, and about new pedagogical methods and their effects.

Does your course, in its pedagogy and its organizing questions, acknowledge the special concerns and strengths of the age groups using it?

YES____ NO____

If yes, cite examples.

Is your course responsive to a wide variety of student and teacher backgrounds and experiences?

YES____ NO____

If yes, in what ways?

In developing your materials, have you given thought to their significance for minority groups in our society?

VERY MUCH____ SOMEWHAT____ PROBABLY NOT____ DON'T KNOW____

What special issues involving these groups did you consider?

Does the program provide opportunities for students and teachers to give and take reciprocally?

YES____ NO____

If yes, cite examples.

Does the program encourage students to pursue a variety of projects in drawing and construction, writing, photography, filming, games?

YES____ NO____

If yes, cite examples.

If no, give rationale for omission.

Does the course help a student build a range of personal competencies, e.g., problem-posing, use of data, working in groups, responding to the ideas of others?

YES____ NO____

If yes, what are your priorities here?

Are specific exercises and activities planned to develop specific competencies?

YES____ NO____

If yes, give two examples.

Is a special vocabulary being used in your course?

YES____ NO____

If yes, cite examples that show how students are helped to understand and master the vocabulary.

5. QUESTIONS ABOUT PEDAGOGY

Is your course inventive in terms of suggested activities, exercises, projects?

VERY____ SOMEWHAT____ NOT AT ALL____

Cite three different activities and their purpose.

Do suggested activities get students involved beyond the classroom -- with friends, parents, community at large?

YES____ NO____

If yes, cite an example.

6. A FINAL QUESTION

Reflecting back on your answers, how do you feel about the state of development of your program?

completely satisfied[1] ____

fairly optimistic[2] ____

something's wrong[3] ____

hopeless[4] ____

[1] You deserve a raise/Virtue is its own reward.

[2] You're coming on strong.

[3] You're trying, but you're in trouble.

[4] Oh dear...

THE NATIONAL HUMANITIES FACULTY, 1266 MAIN STREET, CONCORD, MASSACHUSETTS 01742 / (617) 369-7800

NHF WORKING PAPERS

E-112

How might you modify a course which you have already started to teach without modifying its structure? In his work with NHF project schools, A. D. Van Nostrand has found his idea of the portable module a workable solution for a number of situations.

Mr. Van Nostrand is Professor of English at Brown University.

S8007915

SPONSORED BY PHI BETA KAPPA
THE AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES, AND THE AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

Suppose you want to modify a course which you have already started to teach, yet without changing the structure of that course. How would you go about it? Using a portable module is one way of introducing significant, local change without any major revision.

There are many good reasons for wanting to alter your course temporarily without altering your course plan. For example, a given idea has become more significant than you first thought it was, and you would like a specialist to present it to your class. Or you find that your students need an overview: a chance to pause and relate their previous assignments to the objectives you have set for the course. Or you might want to work with some new material not originally available to you, and you need to find a way to make a trial or pilot run.

For one reason or another you might want to introduce a new and different point of view to your class and to involve your students in a dialogue about it. Your course has been heading east, say, and you want to go north temporarily (or even west). The portable module can accomplish this change in direction without your losing your way. Moreover, if you could draw from a bank of portable modules you could change your course and speed periodically as you head toward your objective.

A portable module (PM) is a subunit of instruction. It is interpolated in the course precisely because it is different. It calls attention to a change of direction, and it purposely involves the students in figuring out why it is there. The portable module can be built and presented by anyone whom the host teacher wants to invite into his classroom. It could be built and presented by the host himself, although it is designed to feature the presence of a guest whose job is to develop a specific view about a subject, which the students can then try to reconcile within the context of the whole course. The likeliest guest is another teacher, although it could be anyone from the school community: a student (or group of students), a guidance counselor, or the vice principal or principal; or it could be someone from the community at large, a specific resource person with special interests.

This possible guest list suggests another feature of the portable module. It is an all-purpose utensil, something like the Swiss army knife, which can be put to many different uses. The PM is designed to serve the needs of a whole program of courses as well as the needs of any one course. In most humanities programs there is a clear need to extend participation to teachers outside the history department and the English department--teachers in the sciences, in studio art, and in music, among others.

One characteristic of the humanities programs that the NHF has worked with is the isolation of the humanities committee within the larger faculty group. There is a noticeable falling off, not because the committee members want to be isolated or because other teachers necessarily want to

stay outside, but because class schedules and teaching loads normally are compartmentalized. Even finding a way to orient new teachers to the program before they join a team becomes a major logistic problem under most present time-slot schedules. But a pod or bank of portable modules, specifically designed to use these human resources, can function within most time-slot limitations.

Another practical consideration comes to mind: the possibility of using the portable module to help orient any substitute teacher in the system.

WHAT IS A PORTABLE MODULE?

A portable module is a subunit of instruction (of variable duration) prepared by a guest and presented in the host's classroom. It is a body of information calculated to introduce a new point of view to the class. It is, therefore, essentially a contract between the host and the guest. Structurally, the portable module is a sequence for presenting a limited amount of information with a specific line of reasoning and a focus.

In this contract the host and guest are trading something of worth. The guest gets a forum in which to try out a new idea, to test it with the benefit of student response, but without having to build a whole course. And the host gets a learning situation for his students and an opportunity to guide them in their own attempts to synthesize. The host always has the responsibility for helping his students learn how to make connections between things, to analyze data, to classify and compare information, and to recognize and evaluate different points of view. The PM can convert his class into a laboratory for experimenting with these conceptual skills. The key is the dialogue that the PM generates, partly during the presentation of the module but principally after it when the students review what happened and why. The dialogue is multiplied: between teacher and teacher, between student and teacher (both host and guest), and between student and student.

The PM makes a virtue out of the seams that always show anyway. Most courses are put together as a sum of units, and sometimes we spend inordinate time making transitions which are often merely cosmetic. In the presentation and review of the portable module, however, the "smooth transition" is no longer really necessary--or even desirable. Instead, the students are involved in something deeper and more basic. They are involved in trying to find a common denominator between the module and some other part of the course or the course as a whole.

HOW TO BUILD A PORTABLE MODULE

Establishing such a system of exchange involves two tasks: first building the individual PMs, and then formalizing a record-keeping procedure for using them. The first task involves building a model as a pattern for the various portable modules.

The model for any PM is a sequential list of questions. The answers to these questions will enable you to transfer information about any given subject. The sequence is complete, but the answers to the questions (written out on one sheet of paper) need be only indicative. The PM will be completed in the presentation (and not even then, but in the review after the presentation).

Given a subject you know reasonably well, it is possible to build your specifications (your answers to the questions) in about 42 minutes, that is, within the one preparation period allowed you in your teaching day (assuming that you can shut the door and escape the usual interruptions). This scheme (this list of specifications or questions) is like an architect's preliminary sketch. You put it aside; and over the period of a week or so, as ideas occur to you, you jot them down in the appropriate place in the sequence. Then prepare a smooth draft (of the questions and brief answers) and a copy (one for you and one for the host), set the date of the presentation, and let the ideas continue to accumulate in the margins.

The scheme for the portable module is a sequence of specifications. The model you are about to see contains nine questions. But the sequence is what is important. It is inductive, it allows the guest to explore what he wants to present even as he makes out the scheme for that presentation. Moreover, when it is completed it becomes an abridged record of the guest's thought process and a reasonable forecast of what is going to happen in class.

Here is the scheme for the portable module:

1. What is the general subject of the PM?

   This could be the subject of the whole course, or the subject of a unit within the course, or some general concept related to the course. If built exclusively from the guest's point of view it could be some concept that he would like to develop.

   For the sake of illustration, suppose that the subject (the answer to this question) is "advertising." With this subject as an illustration we might explore the rest of the questions.

   (This illustration is sketchy and deliberately remote from the kind of subject and the kind of class you would normally be teaching. The purpose in this is to enable you to concentrate on the method itself. You job, of course, is to make the connections between this method and your own teaching situation.)

2. What about the subject?

   There are countless possible answers, but any answer would yield some editorial position about the subject. It could be a hypothesis, that is, an unproven observation that has some predictive value. Or it could be merely an attitude which the guest wants a chance to explain reasonably. In any case, the answer to this question will be a subsubject. It would be self-

limiting, which makes it easier for the presenter to avoid generalizations.

For example, if the subject is "advertising," the presenter might choose to work with one of these (or countless other) propositions:

--it pays to advertise

--advertising exploits the psychological needs of people

--advertising is America's most influential educational instrument

--advertising promotes foolish and unnecessary purchases

--advertising is good for you

These propositions are all different in kind and different in value, but they all have in common the fact that they are editorial. To argue for any one of these is to limit yourself from arguing for most of the others. Each one is self-limiting, and therefore more communicable than the concept "advertising" is.

3. What are the characteristics of the audience?

The purpose of this question is to help the presenter anticipate the various other points of view he is likely to encounter in presenting his own point of view. He may not know exactly who or what his audience is going to be, but he has a general notion. Specifically, how do the traits of this audience bear on the subject he is preparing? What are his listeners' expectations? How well prepared are his listeners for his subject? Do they know nothing about it or something about it? What are their relevant prejudices? What part of the subject is most likely to interest them? Specifically, how will you answer their implied question: "So what?"

Suppose you are presenting your module to an evening class of adults. These men and women are voluntarily taking a course in advertising. Most of them have jobs; you can assume that they want to learn how to use advertising: how to take advantage of it in their jobs, but also how to cope with it as consumers. Obviously, their needs are potentially conflicting; and even realizing this much will help you make certain decisions about how to make your presentation (and how to answer the next question).

4. What line of reasoning will you use to support your proposition (item #2)?

A line of reasoning could also be called an argument; it is the way you get from point A to point N. It is the route you are going to take in presenting and developing your idea. Whatever the route, your listener needs to know it. He needs to know where you think you are going to take him, so that he can listen with assurance and participate if he wants to.

For example, in developing any one of those editorial propositions about advertising, you may decide that you want to present a list of the consequences of advertising. These could be both negative and affirmative. And you might decide to ask your audience how the advertising (or what kind of advertising) caused these consequences. Or you may decide that you want to present a series of advertisements and invite the audience to discuss the consequences in terms of consumer behavior. Either way is a line of reasoning; in this case they are two different ways of getting at cause and effect.

5. What will be the focus in your line of reasoning?

A focus is the principal point of investigation. Without a focus your material might be diffused, and the listeners might infer all sorts of irrelevant associations that would keep them from exchanging their ideas. Without a focus there is no quality control. A focus could be an episode or a case history. It could be a hypothetical situation or a cluster of visual aids. It doesn't much matter, as long as there is a focus.

For example, in the adult evening class on advertising you might decide to limit your remarks primarily to one medium (your principal point of investigation) rather than trying to cover all of the media; or you might decide to focus on the advertising of a single product (your principal point of investigation) in different media; or you may decide to compare the various advertising strategies of two comparable products.

6. What kind of evidence will you present?

Having answered the three previous questions, you already have a fair idea of the kind of evidence to select and how to use it. Evidence can be any kind of information (including myths, opinions, or statistics) that is relevant to item #2 (your proposition); and the best evidence is also relevant to item #3 (the audience's characteristics).

In the advertising class, for example, the problem will lie in the overabundance of evidence available to you. What should you select in order to clarify your proposition? What media are available to you in a classroom? Should the evidence be verbal or visual or auditory? Or some combination of these?

7. What will the members of the audience do?

How do you want them to participate? Do you want to spray them with truth for a while and then let them scratch? Or do you want them to talk back early in the presentation, so that your line of reasoning can proceed by group discussion? And what are they going to do before class or after it? By answering all the previous questions you have also limited your options about how the audience

is to participate. By this time the available choices should be sufficiently clear. In the advertising class, for example, the focus of your line of reasoning will fairly determine how you want the audience to participate.

8. How many class hours (minimum and maximum) will you need?

Notice how far down the list this question is. If you had tried to answer it first you would have limited your own options in building your line of reasoning. In the classroom world, this sequence contradicts the way we usually have to operate, that is, being assigned a time slot which we then have to fill up with something. The portable module is not meant to upset this hoary concept, but merely to make the best of it. Having built the module, if you realize that the time available is not going to accommodate what you would like, you can at least edit the module intelligently, keeping your line of reasoning and your focus intact.

9. What is your title?

A short descriptive title is needed. If you are inspired by a metaphorical title, then discipline yourself; put a colon after the metaphor and state a short descriptive subtitle. This will act as a magnet for you, drawing your impressions together on this subject even as you go about other business. It is also necessary for the host to have for briefing his class before you arrive.

In a revised version of this scheme of questions, the title might be placed at the top of the page along with the author's name. But the point is that you can arrive at a better title after working through all the other questions.

PROBLEMS AND POSSIBILITIES

The module is not only portable, it is also durable. It can be presented again in other, different situations. It can be modified to fit the characteristics and the needs of different audiences, and for this reason the possibility of the PM really lies in its being one component of a system. The strategy is to build a bank or pod of portable modules, so that guests and hosts can reciprocate in various ways.

The PM bank is a mutual association, providing every depositor with an opportunity to draw on the resources of the bank. Build one module and get back another, with the extra advantage of being able to draw from a number of different possibilities. In this respect the bank is richer than any bilateral arrangement would be.

But the bank also poses logistic problems. Who is going to teach in the guest's classroom when the guest is presenting his module in the host's classroom? Who is going to tend the store? This question intensifies two

kinds of problems that already exist: quality control and scheduling. In terms of quality control everyone is used to "covering" for his colleague who is ill or on another assignment; but this is often merely custodial work, and everybody in that class marks time until the host gets back. A bank of modules should tend to improve this situation by making more possibilities for someone to replace that teacher positively (rather than neutrally) while he is a guest in someone else's classroom.

Granted, it is not equally easy in all cases to replace the teacher positively. How are we going to replace the specialist, the French teacher or studio artist or performing musician? Understandably, every specialist is jealous of his students' time. He would probably rather donate a module to the bank on his own time than to accept some custodial attendant as a temporary replacement. Surely this specialist is entitled to a module that will actually help his students.

A solution is possible with a little ingenuity. After all, the scope of the humanities is the whole history of ideas, and the focus of all the humanities is the individual's response to his environment. It would seem that this broad scope and this exact focus of material should be able to yield up a portable module. For example, when the art teacher is away presenting a module to another class, the art students he leaves behind might usefully learn about architecture or the sonata form or the linear structure of a short story or a sonnet, all of which have something to do with painting. (For example, what effect does repetition have on building a structure in any medium? What effect does it have on the viewer or listener--or on the artist?) After such a module, in fact, some of those art students might want to return to one of the humanities classes with a module of their own on the same subject, but emphasizing their point of view as painters. This kind of reciprocity has many possibilities.

The second kind of problem is scheduling: the problem of coordinating the exchange of modules. Combined teaching schedules are like a pile of jackstraws: move one assignment to a different place and the pile falls apart. The PM bank will probably intensify this problem. One way to solve it might be to declare a given week in a semester--call it bank week--when most of the exchanging will take place. With enough lead time for everyone to plan how to use a module, this arrangement seems possible. Another way to live with the problem is to let the debits and credits accrue over a longer period of time, so that separate host-guest contracts can be worked out singly. One person might prepare a module in October and not deliver it until April, but he could draw on the bank in November. The transactions might involve study-hall time or exam time when the teacher can be replaced more easily.

These are routine solutions. You might speculate about others. What the bank really needs to stay in business is a few permanent-floating modules. It needs a guest who is more than custodial, who has something useful to say to students, and who does not have a regular class schedule--for example, a guidance counselor or a vice principal or a principal. The administrator also has some other things going for him. He has been

a teacher, probably in more than one discipline, and he probably has some distinctive relationship with students. A module on the future, focused on career planning, for example, might be his useful contribution to a module bank. And the idea of getting a guidance counselor or principal back into the classroom is enough to inspire our greatest ingenuity. If it works you will have developed considerable support for the coordination of the whole program.

Other kinds of problems dealing with quality control are less urgent but more important than scheduling. The host teacher is, of course, accountable. He cannot be responsible for what the students learn, but he is accountable for increasing the probability of what they might learn through this transfer of information from the guest to the class. Specifically, it is his job to help the students relate the module to the course as a whole. In each case, the module will need to be tailored to the situation: anticipated before it is presented and reviewed afterward. Follow-up is critical. The idea is to use the feedback from the students, so that the guest can change and develop his module. The reward for this effort is the excitement each participant feels. Quality control can't really be sold, but is is contagious.

STEPS IN BUILDING A BANK OF PORTABLE MODULES

What is the best size for a bank? Say, six members? Any more than eight might make bookkeeping too complicated; fewer than five will reduce the variety. If each member deposited two modules in the bank, there would be ten to sixteen modules to draw on, with luck representing four or five disciplines.

Begin with a limited group, say three or four charter members. Each member offers several concepts about which he could build a short module: ideas that he would like to develop, simply because they're on his mind. Everybody brings some of these ideas to the first meeting. A kind of bidding and offering goes on. The strategy is to move quickly. Do not overproduce a module; and don't worry too much about how it gets started. To begin with, it could be oriented toward either the host's class or the guest's idea.

You can build a module in either direction: from the host's point of view (what he wants to bring into the classroom) or from the guest's point of view (what he wants to talk about). The system will take some swapping around. With three charter members, A is B's guest, B is C's guest, and C is A's guest. Set a date (probably within a given week) when the modules will be presented, then work out the traffic problems as best you can. Each party to the contract prepares a module for the host's class, then the procedure is simple: the host announces the experiment to his students; the guest presents the module; the host reviews it with his class. Then the host and guest talk about what happened; and probably the module needs to be repaired before it is presented again for another host.

Then the second phase: suppose each charter member finds one other participant, orients him, and helps him work out a module. After six or eight teachers have built and presented a module, it is time to formalize some flexible traffic control and bookkeeping. A third stage of organization develops a simple debit-and-credit system that will be easy to remember and easy to explain to someone else.

SECOND THOUGHTS

There are at least two major reservations about the portable module bank. One is that the teacher might see it as a burden to a schedule that is already overloaded. He might see it as meaning more work and more time spent trying to communicate with his colleagues in a situation which does not really encourage this.

A second problem will be everyone's natural defensiveness at first. The host and his class are going to talk about the guest behind his back. The guest has to expose himself. And so does the host, insofar as the guest has upset a nice, neat routine. Neither of them can be quite so authoritarian in the face of the other. Both are going to have to accept the fact that they are dealing in truth but not the whole truth; and so are the students. To the extent that everyone can see the possibility beyond one point of view, however, then this experiment may just help everyone to make a few quantum leaps in learning.

WORKSHEET FOR BUILDING A PORTABLE MODULE

1. What is the general subject of the PM?

2. What about the subject?

3. What are the characteristics of the audience?

4. What line of reasoning will you use to support your proposition (item #2)?

5. What will be the focus in your line of reasoning?

6. What kind of evidence will you present?

7. What will the members of the audience do?

8. How many class hours (minimum and maximum) will you need?

9. What is your title?

THE NATIONAL HUMANITIES FACULTY, 1266 MAIN STREET, CONCORD, MASSACHUSETTS 01742 / (617) 369-7800

NHF WORKING PAPERS

B-105

Dr. Hyman Kavett, Associate Professor of Education, Richmond College, City University of New York, prepared this paper out of his belief that "there is no one way to develop any course of study, no formulas, no recipes, no cure-alls." Because there is no one answer, he gives guidance to those seeking an answer for their particular school.

The paper was first addressed to the NHF project in the McAllen High School, McAllen, Texas. The coordinators were Mrs. RoNetta Gower, English, and Mrs. Ora Lee Russell, Social Studies.

SPONSORED BY PHI BETA KAPPA
THE AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES, AND THE AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

There is still hope for mankind when concerned people get together to discuss ways of improving instruction in the humanities. What is most encouraging about such meetings is that the participants really intend to do something about it. It is easy enough to spin out graceful definitions of the humanities, or trace their philosophical and social origins, or rhapsodize about their importance. But what matters more is that we preserve and develop them, by making them an essential part of the lives of our students.

If we are to begin with definitions, then, let us begin by trying to define just what it is we want to achieve in our humanities instruction, and what methods and materials will serve us best, and what we find most promising or most deficient in the most successful humanities courses now actually in existence.

At this conference, we are among friends, and we don't have to convince each other that the humanities matter, or that too little attention has been paid to them in the high schools, or that many of our students at present have precious little contact with the humanities, or that new methods must be devised for doing a better job of teaching humanities in the high schools. What I hope we can do, since we are among friends, is set to work.

When a new humanities program is being planned for a secondary school, there is usually great consternation at first over the question of what is to be included and what left out. The humanities are a large family, with lots of friends. Including the sciences, to begin with: without the sciences, how is one to recognize the underlying predictability of a universe based on natural laws, or develop respect for the discipline of exact measurement, or discover the uses and limitations of rigorous sequential logic? Equally necessary is the study of other cultures and other languages: how can we gain any perspective on ourselves unless we examine and attempt to understand -- to translate -- others who are not like us? The perspectives of history are also essential. Where am I? Where is our nation? Where is the world, in the grand sequence of events? And of course the arts must be included -- music, dance, the drama, literature, painting, sculpture, architecture -- for their examples of creativity and self-expression, so impressive at times as to give an age its name, a city its reputation, a nation its style, an individual his immortality.

I believe that the exact formulation of the subject matter and "coverage" in any given humanities program is less important than it seems at first to the panicky planners. What is important is that a sense of balance be achieved by the team of teachers involved, and that the team be made up of individuals with different interests and passions. No one formulation will suit every teacher or every high school's students.

If you examine what the teachers in Warrensville, Ohio, did in their humanities program then conclude, "Too much emphasis there on the ancient world, at least for our students." that's not discouraging, that's fine! You are aware of what your students will consider irrelevant and know you must either avoid it or devise some means of making it relevant. That's a start.

Suppose you consider next the Langhorne, Pennsylvania, program and decide the approach is too rigid, but that certain innovative uses of media might serve your students well.

Now you are well on the way, not just in your planning, but in coming to an all-important realization: your humanities program, for your school, your students, for you as teachers, must be tailor-made, unique, determined not by general considerations about the true nature of the humanities but by very practical, local, human considerations. If you have a reasonably well-balanced team of fanatics with different talents, training, and enthusiasms but willing to work together in genuine collaboration, then the ideal mixture of subject matters is the one which will give your students those interrelated aspects of the humanities that the team knows most freely and joyously. The difficulty is not, therefore, in defining the ideal program, but in deciding what will work best in your program.

The importance of making bold decisions and then working them out can hardly be overemphasized. What will the basic theme be? Great Ideas? Famous Men and Women? Turning Points in History? Changing Styles and Changing Values? The Images of Man? Expression in Language and Expression in Art? Gods, Men and Nature? Any one of these, or a similar title, will serve, as long as it gestures toward some generously inclusive category; but it is necessary for you to decide, and then work out the implications.

Secondary school time is limited. Humanities programs demand more time in an already overcrowded schedule. Shall you use a film to explain Champollion's decipherment of the Rosetta Stone, or will you obtain a kit for the students so they can go through the decipherment process themselves? You must decide.

Models of successful programs elsewhere are important, giving you examples of what can be done, indicating sources for materials, citing specific titles of literary works, readings in history, works of art, films, and recordings that might be useful, sometimes listing supplementary readings or providing sample questions or describing individual projects. But there will always be some omissions in terms of your interests and some things which seem to you unnecessary or too expensive or beyond the special capacities of the teaching team or your students. And you will note many details suggesting an approach or emphasis or technique that you would find uncongenial or inappropriate in your special circumstances.

You must decide for yourselves what to use and what to alter or omit, in these models, piecing together the most promising features of many, adding some new elements of your own devising, and reordering the whole into the most effective arrangement. At every stage in this planning you will have to make decisions. What matters most, I think, is a tenacity of will, a determination to make the kind of program that both your students and you yourselves will learn from and be excitedly involved in.

One useful guideline during the planning sessions is to remember that both teachers and students are to be actively participating fellow learners. New demands must be made on the teachers as well as the students, and you should plan for a program in which you yourselves will grow in stature.

To illustrate this point, let me ask you to consider one section of the Wappingers Falls, New York, humanities program, and reflect on the demands it makes on both teachers and students. This section is "Timelessness of Art."

Universality of Art

Egyptian and African Sculpture
Western Music
Owen's "Dulce et decorum est"
Waley, "Fighting South of the Castle"

Intrinsicality of Art

Dance Music and Pure Music
Industrial Art and Fine Art
Propaganda and Poetry

Art as Experience (Vicarious) and Imitation of Nature

Shakespeare, Sonnet 73, "That time of year"
Hopkins, "Spring and Fall"
van Gogh, "The Potato Eaters"
Wagner, De Falla, program music

Obviously, students are being asked here not only to see the ways in which art transcends time. They are being asked also to invent their own categories (styles, thematic concerns, affective strategies), and to contrast the "languages" of different arts, and to begin the difficult process of comparing success in different forms (therefore aesthetic evaluation), and to consider the rhetorical (social, political) functions of art as well as the private and emotional functions of expanded individual awareness.

The teachers, of course, are challenged to come up with good ideas on these topics, as well as appropriate responses to, and information about, the exotic materials that are used to generate discussion of the topics. Better still, one sees on closer examination and after second thoughts that, in such a plan or section of a course plan, the teachers are obviously committing themselves to a subject matter and kind of classroom discussion in which there can be few clearly right or wrong answers and in which it is the manner of inquiry which counts and the ability to suspend judgment without suspending inquiry or curiosity or scrupulous attention to the available evidence.

Another experiment which can serve as model or partial model is the one which has given us the occasion to meet here in Austin this spring, the McAllen experiment initiated by Mrs. Gower and Mrs. Russell. The McAllen course is so good and has been so successful that I would like to use it as an example of what can be wrong, for those planning their own experiments. Here are some of the criticisms that I would level at this excellent, adventurous, and rewarding course:

> Only a few faculty members are involved. Although Mrs. Russell and Mrs. Gower should properly retain a leading position, many other faculty members should be drawn into the various presentations, exercises, and experiments.
>
> More disciplines should be represented. Music and art are not fully represented, literature and government are overemphasized.
>
> The syllabus for the course should be revised every year, not just silently altered; clarity in stating educational aims is essential is the experimental flow of new ideas and new exercises is to be maintained.
>
> Some of the teachers should be new, others "on leave", every year. Fresh viewpoints are essential for any continuing experiment.
>
> The teachers should assimilate (or recruit other teachers who have already assimilated) certain other materials: Mexican, Black American, and South American cultures; History of Science; Political Science and Economics; Art, Music, Dance (the senses, the performing arts); Architecture (in both its social and personal dimensions).
>
> (Occasionally) Oriental cultural viewpoints, or other highly exotic and "alien" world views, for contrast. The extremely primitive might also serve this purpose.

(Cautiously) Greater emphasis on the internally consistent nature of the great philosophical systems, and the strengths and limitations of these. Philosophic perspectives are at least as important as historical perspectives, though admittedly less vividly concrete and personal.

You will not fail to notice, I'm sure, that in making these critical observations about the McAllen course I am repeating the very mistake that I urged you not to make: I am returning to some kind of abstract set of standards for an ideal humanities course, rather than thinking of what a few colleagues and I could do for our students in our institution.

There is another use to which experiments like that of Mrs. Russell and Mrs. Gower at McAllen can be put. However imperfect such experiments may be, for your purposes, they should also serve as friendly challenges. For they exist, they have been real experiences for real students and in the best sense real teachers for some years now. Can you take these models and by modification and combination and extension and sophistication go them one better? Moreover, will you have the quickness of human response to understand that, simply by initiating such experiments as these, Mrs. Russell and Mrs. Gower from McAllen and many other innovative high school teachers of the humanities all over the country are asking for a new kind of colleagueship from you as teachers and administrators in other institutions?

If the humanities are to survive, and more than that to flourish, in this time, and with the students of this time, we need more than creative colleagueship within our separate high schools. We need colleagueship between high schools, and between the high schools and the universities and the primary schools and the institutions of our society outside the educational system. We need not only the new approaches that you will develop separately, but also the stimulation and criticism and sense of a common purpose that we can generate together by exchanging information and evaluations as our necessarily different adventures are begun.

William Arrowsmith, while University Professor in Arts and Letters at The University of Texas at Austin, called for the teaching of the humanities as "an ethos or attitude rather than as subject matter." That is the challenge which faces us and also the principle that I hope will unite us and give us the strength to prevail.

THE NATIONAL HUMANITIES FACULTY, 1266 MAIN STREET, CONCORD, MASSACHUSETTS 01742 / (617) 369-7800

NHF WORKING PAPERS

B-103

Professor Frithjof Bergmann, Department of Philosophy, The University of Michigan, wrote this report to the NHF project in the Berea Community School, Berea, Kentucky. He presents the case for the New Way, the substitution of "real teaching" for what was really a kind of "indoctrination."

The school was in the process of designing an eleventh-grade humanities course organized around the theme "The Culture of Man," which would be developed from an in-depth understanding of the Appalachian subculture. The project coordinator was William J. Riffe, Supervising Principal.

SPONSORED BY PHI BETA KAPPA
THE AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES AND THE AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

This letter will be an attempt to summarize my most general reactions to your school and to put down some points which arose in conversation with your faculty and you. It is meant to be a kind of record of that part of my visit.

One main topic that now in retrospect seems to have occupied all of us for quite a lot of time was the question of what the most general structure, or the model, of an integrated program might be. In my mind this issue has two main parts: there is the whole area of methods and mechanics (scheduling, the use of media, team teaching, etc.), but there is also the concern with content, with the intellectual substance.

I soon got the impression that your faculty felt much more confident in relation to the first of these than in regard to the second. On the methods question there also seemed to be a good deal of agreement, and when there were differences they seemed mild. (Everyone concurred that teaching should not be authoritative; most people felt that there was nothing categorically wrong with using lectures -- as long as they were not used too often and were first-rate -- and there was also consensus that films, records, TV, outside speakers, etc., should be involved.)

When it came to the content, however, the picture I got (rightly or wrongly) was quite different. For one thing, it seemed as if people had not thought about this in more than a rather vague and inconclusive manner, yet at the same time the conflicts seemed rather sharp. Most important: everyone seemed a bit uncomfortable with that question. So I soon felt, rather naturally, that if it would be possible for me to make a contribution, then probably it would be in this domain.

Further discussion showed that most of your faculty thought primarily in terms of a chronological, historical arrangement, more because no real alternative to this had come into clear view than because anyone felt a really strong preference for it. In fact many were quite aware of the shortcomings of this sort of structure. In one or another conversation the following were mentioned:

> Some felt that "this really is not very different from what we're doing already" (and this seems true to me since, for example, in teaching literature some history and some history of art are brought in anyway).
>
> Others said that including science and teaching it as history of science just wouldn't work, partly just because knowing 17th-century history really doesn't help a lot with understanding Newton's physics and vice versa.

> Still others thought that "it would confuse the students, that simply setting the now existing subjects side by side, and teaching essentially what is taught now, only somehow 'together' in a mixture, would be 'too much' and would have less unity and meaning than the present schedule." (This, too, seemed true to me. I once taught in a humanities program in which five people worked together on a rotation system, one of us giving Greek history, the next Greek art, the next Greek philosophy, the next Greek literature, and so forth, and that course was a disaster. Greek art does not become that much more meaningful for a student when it is put together with Greek history. We have to remember that the student's experience is very different from ours. For us, who already know something about both, it is interesting to see them together. But for the student both are new, and even if they are taught together, for the student it is only that much more new material. More important still: Greek history and Greek art are not brought closer to the students' own experience when they are joined together. The only difference is that he now gets two sides of a dead culture instead of one.)

The discussion and exploration of these and similar reservations with individual faculty members and small groups took up most of the first and second days' discussion. On the third day we began to look for other ways in which the content could be structured. The general idea was to find alternatives to the historical, chronological approach and preferably to come up with a model that was not open to the objections which we had considered. A number of possibilities were suggested by different people, but one particular one soon emerged as the most promising.

That was the idea of concentrating on topics. We began to think that it might be best to select several problems that are already part of the student's experience (the problem of violence, for example) and that one could then introduce material from a variety of disciplines, all of which would be relevant to that issue.

In the case of violence one might start from violence in Kentucky, then bring in people like Martin Luther King and Cleaver and go from there to Ghandi and pacifism in general, relating this to conscientious objection. Becoming broader one could then draw on biology (for example, on a book like Konrad Lorenz' On Aggression) and consider aggression in the context of animals, and also in that the the theory of evolution, etc. Extending this further one might look at violence from a more psychological perspective (one might read some studies on the relationship between aggression and frustration), and in the same way one might bring in literature (Sophocles' Antigone, for example, could be treated as a way of dealing with the problem of civil disobedience) and of course also music, religion, art, and so forth. One could look at the American constitution in this context, also at various revolutions, etc.

The advantages of this approach seemed to be: 1) that the new material would be at once part of a meaningful and interesting context. The student would encounter it with curiosity. There already would be questions in his mind and the material would relate to those. 2) The integration of the various disciplines would be meaningful and organic. Each of them would be seen to make a genuine contribution to the larger problem, and the student would experience how the theories and facts of all must be considered if one wants to understand the total issue.

In the balance of the time (on the third and the fourth day), we developed this idea. Sometimes in smaller, sometimes in larger groups, we evolved together an outline sketch of a possible syllabus for such a course. Everyone understood that this was entirely tentative. We did it in the spirit of wanting to see what this sort of thing would really look like. The point was to be concrete so as to get the feel of it, and to leave behind all merely general discussions.

The second main item was a discussion of the general philosophical orientation of the whole school and also of the program that we worked on. Many people seemed to feel that they were in the middle of doing something "new and very exciting," but they had never stopped to formally set down a kind of program or a general statement that described and explained what they were doing. So there seemed to be a need for this, and I'll briefly summarize some of the main points of that discussion.

We started from the question: What, in general terms, are you doing? And one answer to that was: We are trying to substitute "real teaching" for what really was a kind of "indoctrination." This phrase does suggest some of the main differences between the Old Way and the New, and some of these are: 1) The developments of certain attitudes and skills and habits (e.g., the development of genuine curiosity, of the habits of awareness) over the rote acquisition of certain information. 2) The New Way stresses, in line with this, the activity and initiative of the student and wherever possible does not put him into the role of a passive recipient. 3) The New Way stresses the individuality of each student and approaches him with the respect that is due to him as a person.

Having clarified this much (and this is of course very easy) one has to ask the next (and more difficult) question, namely: What goals justify these changes? It is important to understand this question clearly. Part of its point is that to those who are not yet convinced the New Way obviously does in some way less than the Old Way (the most frequently heard objection being: but the kids won't know the things we used to teach them). And this is perfectly true. Some things that the Old Way did the New Way will not do . But then this needs to be justified and explained. In other words, we have to show what about the New Way of teaching is so good and so important that it is superior to the Old Way even though it on some counts does less. We have to show that the New Way can do something that the old one could not do and that the things that only the New Way can do more than make up for the losses.

Once we state it like this it becomes clear, I think, that some of the usual reasons that people give for the New Way are not good enough and are not the "real reasons." that is, are not the reasons that actually motivate us in changing to the New Way. For example: If one tries to justify the New Way with the argument that it produces good citizens, one is not on very solid ground. For one thing, it is not clear that the Old Way couldn't do this. Some people may very rightly feel that the Old Way with its greater emphasis on discipline and good behavior in fact did a better job of this, and they may feel that some of the qualities that the New Way produces in students are actually a kind of hazard (for example, that the New Way produces students who are perhaps too individualistic and too critical to be the best citizens). I don't mean that I would agree with this. But there is some truth in it, and this reason therefore is not decisive.

The same sort of thing is true of several other reasons. One can't really say that only the New Way produces individualistic people. It is just not wholly true. The older generation is very apt to feel that they became individuals without any of this fancy "new-fangled stuff." And they would be at least not completely wrong. In fact they might feel that it's good to experience some authority and harshness because "that gives one something to rebel against."

It also is not very convincing to say that the New Way and only the New Way can create people with pride, or self-respect, or dignity. It is again the same story. The New Way may be at some advantage in giving people these qualities, but its advantage is not really decisive when it comes to them, and the creation of these qualities is therefore not the real reason for changing to the New Way.

On a different level is the idea that "values are subjective." That is, sometimes people try to justify a modern teaching method by saying that no one has a right to impose his values on someone else and that therefore there must not be any "authoritarian" teaching. This justification is not just inconclusive; rather, I feel that it is downright misleading, and altogether bad. It is misleading simply because none of us, when it comes right down to it, really leaves the value question open and honestly does not in any way influence the values of our students. And I think that it is very good that we do not. The trouble is that using this as our reason leads to an inconsistency that makes both students and parents often angry, and with justice. If we say that we teach as we do because we do not want to unduly influence the students, then they have a right to insist that we abide by this and that we allow them to live by completely different values from the ones we hold. But in practice none of us is willing to carry this through without some sort of limits, and once the student hits these limits he can accuse us of hypocrisy, and so can the parent.

If these three reasons are not very strong (essentially "soft" reasons), we can now list a few that are stronger, more down to earth, and "harder". The first becomes apparent if one compares what knowledge used to be with what it is now. The crucial difference is that knowledge

these days becomes rapidly outdated, that many fields change very quickly. Also, the world itself changes much faster, and this means that what is now useful knowledge may no longer be of any use tomorrow. One illustration of this may be the fact that many of the large corporations (IBM, GE, and so forth) often hire philosophy majors and not those who majored in economics or business administration just because many of the things that business administration majors learn are already done by machines when they graduate. This means that we often simply do not have the knowledge that a sixteen-year-old may need when he is twenty-seven. With the best will in the world, we just could not teach him "the information" or "the facts" that he may need to know. We don't know what the world will be like fifteen years from now. Therefore, we must teach him something that will be of value to him then.

And that only the New Way of teaching can do, because it teaches things that do not become obsolete. It teaches people how to find out when they do not know, how to think out a problem. It tries to develop the curiosity of each student so that he will be aware of the very different world in which he may have to live.

A second strong reason for the New Way is the simple fact that none of us can do anything well unless we know who and what we are. I mean this in the most hard-headed sense. We have to know what we want, what we like, what we can do, what our talents are, what we value, and what we think. Without that we will be no good to anybody. But to this whole job of helping each individual growing man and woman with the huge job of finding out these things, the Old Way must did not address itself. With that it gave no help. But the New Way can. It takes each individual student more seriously and makes more allowances for his individuality, not because that is the only way in which "individualistic" people can be educated, but because it wants not just to educate each student about the world but to educate him also about himself. It wants to help each student in the task of self-discovery, and in this task the methods of the New Way can help much more than those of the Old.

Another, third, reason for the New Way is the unabashed conviction that we do want to help in the creation of certain kinds of people. We want to educate people who are spirited, fully alive, sensitive, flexible, curious, imaginative, and creative. And we believe that the New Way is much better equipped for this than the Old. It is this belief that is our simplest and strongest reason for teaching in the New Way.

Once we have a firm grasp of the fact that these are our main reasons (and I could just as well have said that these are our main goals and ends: that we want to teach skills and attitudes that will still be useful even in an unknown future, that we want to help in the task of self-discovery, and that we want to help create fully alive and fully awake people), we will of course be in a better position to make the small and practical decisions. But this goes without saying.

THE NATIONAL HUMANITIES FACULTY, 1266 MAIN STREET, CONCORD, MASSACHUSETTS 01742 / (617) 369-7800

NHF WORKING PAPERS

A-106

Professor David Tyack, Department of Education and History, Stanford University, prepared this set of questions, ASK YOURSELF ABOUT THE HUMANITIES, for the use of individuals or groups who are thinking about making changes in the humanistic offerings of their curriculums. The questions are intended for private pondering and public discussion, especially during the early stages of planning.

SP 007 475

SPONSORED BY PHI BETA KAPPA
THE AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES, AND THE AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

ASK YOURSELF ABOUT THE HUMANITIES

1. What does the concept "humanities" mean to you?

2. Why are you concerned about improving the teaching of the humanities?

3. Most people agree that the humanities deal, in some fashion, with values. This might have many meanings. For example:

a. passing on intellectual and cultural traditions
b. teaching students to understand and empathize with contemporaries of different backgrounds
c. helping students to clarify their own convictions and to understand alternative value systems
d. developing a sense of individual and social identity in a period of crisis in values
e. getting students to accept the values current among the leading citizens of the community
f. connecting the value-world outside the school in the adolescent culture with the school curriculum

Some of these are overlapping views. How, in your opinion, should we face the question of values in the humanities curriculum?

4. For many years people have been saying that it is necessary to have a democratic atmosphere in the schools in order to teach democracy effectively. Is the same point true of the humanities? Are the schools humanistic in atmosphere? In what ways could they be made more so?

5. In what ways, if any, should students participate in designing a humanities curriculum?

6. In what ways might the current subjects relate to the humanities? When we talk of a humanistic curriculum, we might mean:

   a. a new course or courses, perhaps combining several disciplines (such as art, music, English, social studies, and perhaps even science or foreign languages)
   b. a more "humanistic" emphasis in the regular subjects
   c. some combination of a and b, or perhaps a new type of program entirely (such as some sort of involvement in the community, new forms of independent study or creative projects, etc.)

   Are there any special advantages or disadvantages to each of these alternatives as opposed to the others? What other alternatives would you add to this list?

7. What role, if any, should minority group contributions and problems play in a humanities curriculum? Should black history and culture, as an example, be taught either in a separate course or in an integrated fashion in humanities offerings?

8. Many of the most serious human predicaments today stem from scientific technological developments (one thinks, for example, of overpopulation, pollution, mass warfare, or the impersonality created by a machine-computerized system). Indeed, some say that man's very survival is at stake and that only the proper use of science can extricate us from the traps which science has created. Are such concerns relevant to a humanities curriculum? If so, what role might the sciences play in a "survival course"?

9. What changes, if any, might be desirable in teaching arrangements for a humanities approach? For example:

   a. variable scheduling (some classes longer or shorter)
   b. team teaching
   c. interdepartmental teaching
   d. independent study or creative projects
   e. different methods of evaluation (are conventional testing and grading appropriate?)

10. To what degree are the schools expected to turn out a standardized academic product for the colleges or employers? Does this constrict the options available in a humanities program? Should it?

11. To what extent, if any, should humanities programs include newer media as a regular part of the course of study? For example:

a. popular music (the Beatles, Simon and Garfunkle)
b. television (documentaries, analysis of "The Prisoner")
c. science fiction as projections of sociological and technological developments into the future
d. films
e. op or pop art

12. Numerous observers have commented on the fragmentation of the contemporary school. By subject: separating literature from music or history, for example. In space: separate classrooms of similar size in which teachers are isolated from each other. In time: the day is chopped up into several periods of uniform length (the historical origins of this "Carnegie Unit" are quaintly irrelevant). On the other hand, many teachers worry lest individual subjects become submerged and lost in a combined approach and believe that specialization is essential to competence today. How do you feel about this issue? What implications does it have for the development of humanities?

THE NATIONAL HUMANITIES FACULTY, 1266 MAIN STREET, CONCORD, MASSACHUSETTS 01742 / (617) 369-7800

NHF WORKING PAPERS

D-100

On September 23, 24, and 25, 1971, a first visit to the NHF Individual Project in Lawrence High School, Lawrence, Kansas, was made by a Faculty team consisting of

James L. Enyeart, Assistant Director and Curator of Photography, The University of Kansas Museum of Art

Paul A. Haack, Associate Professor, Department of Music Education, The University of Kansas

Charles Muscatine, Professor, Department of English, University of California, Berkeley

John Ratté, Professor, Department of History, Amherst College

This NHF Working Paper is in two parts: Professor Ratté's most graphic description of the NHF team in action, and a report from the key school personnel, Helen Shumway, Karen Clark, Eleanor Lockhart, and Larry Williams, describing the results of the visit from the school's viewpoint.

SPONSORED BY PHI BETA KAPPA
THE AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES, AND THE AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

I prepare this auxiliary report on my participation in the discussions aimed at creating a humanities course at Lawrence High School in Lawrence, Kansas, with a great deal of enthusiasm and a number of very sharp and very provoking memories of the three days I spent in Lawrence in September 1971.

I went to Lawrence in a state of considerable nervousness. I had received around September 13 a letter from Helen Shumway proposing that we begin our discussions on September 23 in a rather dramatic fashion. She wrote: "Using the theme 'Fake or Real?' and starting from a period of time around 1900-1914, could you plan a 30-40 minute presentation to be given to a class at 2 p.m.? We wish to observe how you involve yourselves in the planning process, since economy of time is one of our planning headaches. As you see fit, this need not be limited to western culture."

I puzzled over this assignment for some time. I could not bear to entertain the thought that the other three consultants and I would actually create a coherent class as a laboratory performance for the high school teachers in Lawrence, and so I settled for the somewhat easier task of working up a presentation of my own.

Beyond this procedural difficulty there was another one. Precisely what was intended by the words "fake" and "real"? Taking the question from the historian's point of view, I thought that one might argue that a part of history -- an event, a thought, a revolution, a poem -- might be considered real if it spoke to the concerns of the world examining it. A sensitive historical memory, then, would be one which realized that what we consider to be real in the past might well have seemed fake to its contemporaries, and the reverse would also be true.

I set about finding a number of comparative problems which would dramatize this idea. Which is fake and which is real: the idealism of President Kennedy's inaugural address, or the cynical universal power drive satirized in McBird? Which is fake and which is real: a poem written in 1914 praising the heroism and romance of death on the battlefield for a British soldier who "goes to join the heroes at Agincourt," or a poem written in 1918 which derided the tradition that it is "sweet to die for one's country"? Which is real and which is false in the German national tradition: the political and military achievements of Adolf Hitler, or the heroism and self-sacrifice of von Stauffenberg? Which is real and which is fake: Hitler's belief that all good culture is German culture; or the spirit of the Jewish violinist described by Elie Weisel in his book Night, who dies on a heap of corpses playing the music of Beethoven?

I had several other dramatic examples of conflicting interpretations of a piece of historical experience or of a personal response to "reality," but these will suffice. The theme for my discussion was taken from Carl Becker's book The Heavenly City of the Eighteenth Century Philosophers:

"If our memories of past events are short and barren, our anticipations of future events will be short and barren; if our memories are rich and diversified, our anticipations of what is to come are likely to be more or less so."

It was my argument that our memories are a function of our experience in our own lives and also of our learning. Thus we can remember things we have not done. We can remember Hitler and we can remember Buddha and we can remember President Kennedy and we can sympathize and understand the past and the possibilities for human action in the future through this enlarged memory. This memory is our culture. It is handed on from one generation to another, but it is also transformed within a given generation, and it clearly includes the conflict among the more personal cultures of the individuals living together in a town or in a nation at a given time.

So I got on the plane to Kansas full of fear and trembling, wondering if this preparation would be of any use and suppressing the possibility that it was not at all helpful. Later that evening, having arrived, been met at the airport, and got settled into my room at the Holiday Inn, I talked for some time with Charles Muscatine about this difficult question of "Fake or Real?" It was his opinion that we had been told to come up with a group preparation and a group performance, and that he thought this was indeed a difficult assignment. We were not sure just what "fake" and "real" should mean. I described briefly the ideas that I had, and it seemed best to both of us that we should begin the discussions on the next morning by trying to find out just what the teachers in Lawrence High School had in mind and what ideas they had already developed for the humanities course which we were to jointly prepare.

We began our talks on a beautiful sunny morning in a small group which consisted of the four consultants and approximately six to nine members of the faculty and administration of Lawrence High School. It became clear that Mr. Enyeart and Mr. Haack felt more or less the way Charles Muscatine and I did. It simply was impossible for four men who had not met or worked together tc come up with a presentation and then to actually give that presentation to students later on in the day. The four consultants did not seem to understand exactly what was intended by the rubric "Fake or Real?"

At this point I volunteered to give a severely abbreviated version of the presentation which I had prepared, explaining repeatedly that I was quite convinced that this was not a good class plan even if it should prove possible to develop it with visual materials and to enlarge it with a discussion of literature and music. The discussion which followed my brief outline of my utilization of the notion "Fake or Real?" for materials dealing with the culture of Western Europe and America since 1900 was useful if only because it showed how four men working in four different disciplines in the humanities disagreed among themselves as to what was worth presenting to students.

It was now midmorning. We were into our second cup of coffee (or perhaps our third or fourth) and the doughnuts were rapidly disappearing. We faced the prospect of meeting with the students from Lawrence High School, largely drawn from Larry Williams' courses in music, within a few hours. It was clear that we did not have a unified presentation for such a meeting. What could we do instead?

The discussion now became general, with consultants and faculty members interrupting each other and informing each other and contributing to a growing sense that a humanities course for this school should deal with language, should deal with culture (although we were not yet ready to define that term), and should deal with the symbols which were most important to the lives of the students in this particular school. We wanted to worry about contemporary American society. We wanted to worry about the culture of the blacks in Lawrence, Kansas, and we wanted to worry about the culture of the many peoples who had lived in this part of the continent before the European immigrants arrived.

Some of us argued that it was important to provide a counterpoint to the study of contemporary American culture, and a counterpoint even to the contribution of contemporary black and Indian culture within America through the study of cultures and societies startlingly unfamiliar to the high school students in Lawrence, Kansas, today. Professor Muscatine suggested that the life of the contemporary Japanese adolescent coming to maturity in a Japanese city in which traditional society and modernity were in uneasy tension would be a meaningful and surprisingly close counterpoint to the experience of an American adolescent. I suggested that some of the rituals and customs of contemporary South Asian, especially Indian, society might make similar points.

There was a sense, as I find it in my notes, that we needed "to provide teachers with the tools for integrating ethnic group contributions into their curriculum." Teachers at Lawrence High School were eager "to incorporate a realistic presentation of those ethnic group contributions and experiences."

The discussion now turned to the vexed question of "Fake or Real?" Helen Shumway and Larry Williams and other members of the Lawrence faculty tried to explain to us why they had chosen this rubric as a methodological device for our preparation. I think I am right in saying that Helen Shumway had in mind an orientation toward aesthetic problems. We were wondering, in other words, about modes of perception. Were the impressionist painters at the end of the 19th century portraying a real world, or were they distorting it in a hopeless and helpless fashion? Mr. Haack wondered if this same way of discussing creative work couldn't be illustrated by a comparison of "fake rock and real rock."

After at least an hour of struggling with this kind of distinction it became clear, as Professor Muscatine helped us to see, that we were in fact talking about two different uses of the notion "Fake or Real?" On the one hand, we were thinking about a course which would introduce students to the cultural determinents of value in aesthetic experience and, by implication, in judgments of value throughout the entire pattern of social action. On the other hand, we were talking about the way in which people present reality and deliberately distort it within a given social context

As I try to accurately remember the way the talk went that morning it seems to me that I tended to consider the inquiry into aesthetics, that is to say an inquiry into the way in which a culture decides on real and vital symbols for its experience, to be the main issue. Charles Muscatine, however, thought that we would be better off if we concentrated on the distortions of reality that are deliberately introduced within a society rather than on the distortions that occur in the world of the artist and the poet. I remember a dramatic example: Charles Muscatine spoke most effectively about the work of Ralph Nader and suggested that we could involve students who were not particularly interested in words or pictures, but who were eager and capable at working with their hands, in the subject matter of this course by discussing the hood and engine of a contemporary American overpowered automobile, asking "Fake or Real?" and applying that question to the relationship between the design of the American automobile and its actual performance.

We all felt, in a rather vague way, that the best moments for class discussion would occur when we could deal both with the question of reality and falsity in the perception of the artist or the interpreter of cultural reality and with the problem of reality or deception in the particulars of modern life. But we didn't quite know how to do both.

You may not believe it, but we were still talking and lunchtime had not yet come. Our movement from conference room to lunch suddenly acquired a note of drama. It appeared that there was some action in the corridors of the high school. Black students, stimulated, perhaps, by the fact that the faculty was about to discuss and evaluate the results of several week-long discussions about the problem of race and education in the Lawrence schools, were expressing anger and unhappiness. We took a detour around the central class area in order to get to the dining room. There, while eating, we discovered that a black student who had been a class leader the year before was now being asked to leave the school grounds. Several of our friends in the school faculty make it clear that they were disturbed by this resurgence of racial feeling and that they saw our discussions and the creation of this course in the humanities as a way of helping the people in the school and in the town to cope with this problem which had been so much on everyone's mind since the disturbances a few years earlier.

As we returned to the conference room when lunch was over, Larry Williams, the music teacher, found himself the object of some derisory comments from a few students whom he had disciplined earlier in the year. These students were black girls; Larry was identified by his clothing and by his crime. I felt very strongly, as we re-entered the building where we were to meet for the afternoon, that Larry Williams and these other teachers were indeed under a great deal of stress in that they were trying at one and the same time to enrich the offerings of the high school and to wrestle with the difficult problem of bringing their colleagues and their community face to face with what they saw as a real and serious problem of racial misunderstanding.

Of course I did not know what had passed between Larry Williams and the black students who yelled at him as he left the dining room. What I did know, from our conversations in the car the night before as we drove from the airport to Lawrence, was that Larry Williams and other members of the group interested in creating the humanities course and in using the resources of The National Humanities Faculty had themselves been very much involved in long and painful discussions during the summer, discussions with other whites and with blacks in Lawrence, discussions aimed at bringing before the high school administration and faculty proposals for relieving tensions and improving the opportunities for black students in that school system.

When we got back to the conference room, I studied once again the design which Paul Haack had placed on the board in the morning. He had tried to show us in visual form the kind of presentation, the kind of course, that we were moving toward in our discussion of culture. His drawing showed a three-dimensional box divided into a number of layers on horizontal lines. Each subsection of the box represented a culture. The first might be that of Lawrence, Kansas, and of the United States today. The second might be that of Lawrence fifty years ago. (Charles Muscatine had already suggested that there might be great resources for self-understanding and for a contrast to the world of Lawrence today if students were to look at the culture of Lawrence as it existed in, say, the year 1905.) The next subdivision of the cube might represent contemporary Japanese culture and the next might represent the culture of India today.

As we studied this diagram and began to play with it, it seemed clear that there were certain themes that might be pursued through each of the cross sections of a culture. To start with, there might be some basic symbol common to several cultural experiences that could be seen in its transformations. There might be ways of organizing family life or politics which could be traced through each of the cultures. In every case one would wish to examine the art, the music, the literature, the dance, the architecture of the individual society or culture in order to see how the general theme was illustrated or developed.

As we examined and tried to develop this model, some consensus developed. It seemed clear that we should not worry about a chronological survey, either for Lawrence, Kansas, or for the culture of the United States or for the culture of any other society with which we might wish to develop a comparative study. We really did want to emphasize the major symbols or symbolic structures of several cultures, but we agreed that an exclusive emphasis on symbols would be misleading and ultimately rather dull. It was suggested that we might consider the great masterpieces of a given culture or society, but this approach seemed to be too exclusive, too literary, too much oriented toward the track 1 student with a college career ahead of him. Perhaps we could get around that limitation by discussing the creation of several humanities courses, each with three or four key ideas, and try to develop all of them within these few precious days that we had together. But this idea was rejected. There was too little time.

We were now getting to know each other somewhat better and we were becoming more sensitive to the urgency of a course that would deal with contemporary social realities. If there were to be more humanities courses at Lawrence, they should grow out of the one we were trying to design now.

I now find in my notes an amusing card. I think I find it more amusing now than I did when I wrote it. For in fact it was getting on to one o'clock and at two o'clock students were going to arrive, and we didn't have a presentation on the part of the four visiting plumbers, and we didn't yet have anything to do instead. And my card reads:
A PRESENTATION! OF SOMETHING FOR THIS AFTERNOON, RIGHT AWAY AND SOON.
HOW MUCH TIME? NOT ENOUGH, THAT'S WHAT IS HAPPENING. RIGHT AWAY.
OH, YES.

And so we started to worry and to worry very hard about what to do with the students. We were all agreed that it was important that the four consultants should actually be in touch with the people of Lawrence High School, that is to say, more in touch with them than you are when you eat with a few hundred in a crowded and noisy cafeteria. But what should we do?

Discussion aimed at answering that question tended to emphasize the importance of the idea of culture. We needed to teach students how to speak in the language of their culture. Yet students had a language of their own. If we were to let them have only their own language, we could never teach in a concrete way the "old fogey" materials of our culture.

But there were questions we could ask that unified or transcended both our language and theirs. How do human beings express their feelings and beliefs? How do human beings find values for their lives? It seemed that they expressed their feelings and discovered and expressed their values in their dance, in their art, in their buildings -- including their domestic architecture as well as their churches or temples or academic structures or political centers.

How do people cluster? They cluster together in cultures. The quality of their culture, the quality of their life style is relative, can only be judged relative to the world view of that culture. A culture obviously includes subcultures: thus the culture of late 19th-century France included both academic art and the painting of les Fauves. The culture of contemporary America clearly included both the dominant culture of the white majority and those elements of the subculture of the black and of the many Indian tribes which had been built into it for now more than a hundred years. It also included those elements of those subcultures which were in tension and unresolved conflict with the dominant culture.

It looked more and more as if the humanities involved questions like what is good, what is bad, what is right, what is wrong? It was suggested that we were treading on the feet of a monster called religion. (We were not necessarily treading on the feet of those other monsters known as psychology and sociology.)

But now the crunch was on and we had to decide. It seemed best to attempt a kind of brain-storming approach. We would present a question to the group of about twenty students who were just about to arrive (this number had been whittled down from the seventy-odd lined up for our four-man lecture). The question would be: "What do you want to know about how men and women get their values?"

Why had we settled on this question? Well, it seemed that what we really wanted to do was to ask the students what they thought should go into a humanities course. But it also was clear that they would opine that we should know what ought to go into a humanities course. Putting the question would be a way of putting off the students. The best thing for us to do was to try to find out the sorts of things these students felt they needed to know in order to come to decisions about the important questions in their own lives. By finding that out, we would have some hints as to what aspects of the cultural experience of the rest of the American society and of other societies we ought to draw on in creating the humanities program.

So we had the question and as the fire doors were pushed wide open, and as we struggled to move the great oak table around which the school committee met into the corner of the room, and as we found places on the floor and on folding chairs, the students arrived and we began what turned out to be an extraordinarily stimulating and, in the long run, rewarding and amusing discussion.

I might just as well explain the amusement right away. What happened in this discussion was that we moved, inevitably, it now seens in retrospect, toward the question which a student put to us in the last few seconds before the period ended. And this question was "How do you tell what is fake and what is real in the study of a culture or of a way of living?"

I put this revelation about the end of our exchanges with the students at the beginning of this part of the report because the question seemed to be such a vindication of the insight that Helen Shumway and the other members of the Lawrence faculty had had into the real heart of an investigation of human culture and of those products of man's life and thought and invention which we group for the sake of academic convenience under the rubric "humanities". But before we got to that marvelous moment, a moment which you can well imagine produced considerable laughter among the consultants and the faculty and some momentary confusion for the student who had asked it, I must recount the general drift of our discussion and of the students' attempts to answer the question we had presented to them.

We had said: What do you think counts? And after some long silences the students replied that they thought that personal relations, race, "the total environment," psychology, and at least two dozen other categories, quickly scribbled on the board, all needed to be understood if a person was to understand what mattered in his life.

Charles Muscatine was pleased with the phrase "total environment" and asked the students to speak more to that idea. One young man sitting on the floor began to describe the importance of football for people living in Lawrence, Kansas. "There was football on the corner lot when you were in elementary school. There was football in the high school or rather in the junior high school and then in the high school when you got there. There was of course football at the university." We all knew that this was "Big Blue Country." (I knew, I might add parenthetically, that the post office where I mailed my letters home for those three days, was the "JAYHAWK" substation of the Lawrence post office.) The young man continued: "There was university football, and then there was football in the pro leagues. The whole of a person's life could be organized around football. A person who cared about football would be thinking about it from the time that he was a little kid until he was a grown man."

This was a compelling example of a "total environment." But there was another student. He spoke up. He said, "All this talk about football is just a fake. No one really cares about football that much. At least I don't. There are more important things in life. Football is not one of them for me."

I cannot attempt to recreate this exchange or any of the other arguments which developed among the students and between them and us. The general thrust of the talk, however, was not hard to pin down. The young man who attacked the cult of football also attacked the teachers at the high school. They were tired. They were automatic. They didn't care for that subject and neither did their students. The young lady sitting at his feet spoke back. She was learning a great deal from her course in medieval civilization. They were reading poems. They were

learning how to listen to and to perform medieval music. Time spent in the high school for her was not simply marking time. There were two black students at the meeting. One asked pointedly, "Can you tell me why I shouldn't leave high school right now?" Jim Enyeart thought this was an extremely important question, an important contribution to our consideration as to what students wanted to know about and wanted us to deal with in discussing the humanities at Lawrence High School. The student who hated football returned to the attack: "The trouble was that people said they believed in things they didn't believe in. Lots of people said yeah, yeah, football, football, but football didn't mean a thing to them. The same was true about school." "Were there ways of knowing what was important and what was not important, what people believed in and what they only pretended to believe in?" we asked.

It was at this point that a young lady asked us the crucial question. How do you know what is fake and what is real?

The students left, and we were left to wonder what had happened and what sense we could make of it. One thing seemed very clear. In the course of the questions and answers that had gone back and forth during the previous hour, one student had stood up -- in fact he was the student who was standing up all during the meeting but had been silent for most of it -- and said, "I think that you are talking about culture. Culture is the thing we need to study." I have a vague suspicion that I am giving more order and pointedness to that young man's remarks than might have been the case, but I do remember very sharply that he introduced the idea of culture, the idea which we had spent so much time discussing earlier that day. When the students left, therefore, it seemed right for us to continue to worry about the notion of culture. We also spent some time thinking about the problem of further meetings with students. Could we? Should we? By now the afternoon was wearing on and it seemed best to stop for the day and to begin again fresh the next morning.

Charles Muscatine and I talked about what we had heard and said during the day at dinner that night. Later in the evening we met with Paul Haack at Jim Enyeart's house. We listened to ancient recordings of Caruso. We talked about modern photography. We listened to hard-rock, soft-rock, and forms of rock I didn't know existed. We listened to Jesus Christ Superstar. We never once talked about the humanities or the problems of Lawrence High School, and yet I felt as I fell asleep that night that we had done some more research of a kind that no one could have set up for our program.

That night and at breakfast the next morning the two of us who were staying at the Holiday Inn had decided that we really needed to ask the teachers what they could tell us about what they were already doing in their courses, about what they were doing in their courses which might be done in the new course that we were attempting to design. It seemed sensible that during the next day we should try to develop one dimension of that cube model which Paul Haack had put on the board the

day before. We should try to find one moment in time within the culture of America, or the culture of Lawrence, Kansas, within America, which could be studied and compared with a similar moment in other cultures. We thought that students might meet with us again or that we might meet again with students and that we might ask them to elaborate some other dimension of their culture beyond football and the mythology of the "Big Blue Country."

We had been tending in the discussions on the first day to emphasize too much the technical or anthropological aspects of the culture idea. We certainly didn't want to involve the faculty at Lawrence High School, or the students, in a detailed study of the development of a culture seen from the point of view of food gathering, family organization, etc. We could use the various concepts developed by anthropologists to discuss the notion of culture, but we certainly did not need to commit ourselves to teaching these notions to students.

The main idea that we were concerned with was the idea of the plurality of cultures, the fact that many different societies of men and women around the world had organized themselves and their beliefs and their ways of treating life and death in many different fashions, and, along with that, the idea that there were strong and powerful continuities among the various cultures of men through which understanding could be developed from one society to another.

We were asking ourselves what are the goals of a course like this? And in a curious way much of what we were thinking could be summed up in the answer: we want to develop in these students a sensitivity to the "hamburger highway" on the edge of which our motel was built. That is to say, we wanted to help students to realize their own culture, to realize the arbitrariness and yet the meaningfulness of the symbols -- the grill work on their cars, the big MacDonalds sign, the American flag, the steeples on the many churches of Lawrence, Kansas, the entirety of their culture and its parallels and resemblances to the cultures of other societies living today and to the antecedents of their culture in the past.

But should we concentrate on "moments" or should we start with major themes? We should ask the teachers: what elements of contemporary Lawrence, Kansas, culture do you want to emphasize? Do you want to begin with a slide tape on the life of this city? Do you want to emphasize the idea of community within this city as a theme? Do you want to look backward to the year 1905 to find more or less coherence? Should the course begin with the student? Should it ask where do you come from? What is your culture? Or should it start with riddle situations from other cultures and force students to deal with the puzzling nature of man in his most foreign or unfamiliar manifestations?

These were all questions that we mulled over at dinner and at breakfast before the second-day meetings.

The second day was cool and brisk. We walked from the motel to the school. There were no students around. It was a holiday and the only people at work were the people who probably needed a holiday more than the students: the faculty interested in this weird project. We met in the social studies seminar area beyond a bookcase containing thirty-odd copies of J. Edgar Hoover's indictment of liberalism in American society. I wondered who had bought or foisted those books onto the school. This was going to be a demanding day. We would have our discussions in the morning. We would have our lunch at the Elks Club with the principal. Then there would be a recess while the faculty members who had been involved in the summer discussions on the question of race and school administration met with the rest of the faculty to decide what steps, if any, might be taken to improve the school. And then after that meeting we would have our discussions once more for the rest of the afternoon. So we sat down, drank coffee, met our new members, and began to talk.

I drew on the blackboard Paul Haack's cube model and then drew on the board a circle which seemed to contain the beginnings of possible units which might be designed and researched for the humanities course. I should mention that the struggle over the chalk was a fundamental part of this day's activities and that whoever got to the board first often won, at least for the moment, a crucial point.

I seemed clear that we began at a point 1. At that point the question was: Where are you, what is the culture of the student in Lawrence, Kansas? How to answer that question was left open for the moment.

Next, at point 2 might come the immersion of the student in some foreign situation. Was there some riddle, some ritual, in another society to which the student might be introduced and which might dramatize similar moments in his own experience, moments whose meaning had not yet struck him?

A third point would be the broader community or tradition of the society in which the student lived and in which his forebears had lived. This area or unit would be an investigation of the past; this clearly was the point at which the student might investigate the society of Lawrence, Kansas, in 1905, as Professor Muscatine had suggested.

The next point on our circle, moving from twelve o'clock clockwise, was the study of the objects through which men living in a given culture expressed the values of their community, expressed the uniqueness of their differences from other cultures and other societies -- the objects in which, in other words, they defined for the outside world "where they were." This would be one of the larger units in the course, this would be the place to study the "made things" of the society, the art, the architecture which the community had produced and in which it expressed its essential spirit.

We had now gone halfway around a circle, and we had half a universe to cover before we came back to the point from which we had taken our departure. We leaped ahead and tried to imagine how this course might end. Several people suggested that we needed to move toward the future, that we needed to imagine how a good society, a society which tried to bring together the best of technology and the best of the traditions of the past, might be arranged. It seemed, therefore, that the course might well end with the effort to create a Utopia. The final project of this humanities enterprise would be the building in literature, in art, in architecture, in town planning of an ideal community, one which preserved those aspects of the familiar world which seemed most valuable and which added to the viable past the best dimensions of even most foreign and unfamiliar worlds.

Now we had a great gap. We had where the students began from, we had the riddles of other cultures, we had the general investigation of community, the great themes and meaningful ideals of the society, we had the investigation of the art and the architecture and the literature of the society and we had an attempt to design its future. At this point Charles Muscatine suggested that it was not enough to think of a culture expressing itself in buildings and in paintings and in music, but that there were basic patterns of rhythm and movement -- in dance, in architecture, in town planning, in the utilization of transportation, and the like -- wherein the spirit or central characteristic of a given culture could be discovered and could be transformed. Helen Shumway wondered what provision we had made in this developing circle of inquiry for communication, for the symbols of a culture which we had discussed the day before.

We now began a complicated process of revising this initial sketch, a process which continued into the afternoon and into the following morning. At first we tried to suggest that the community was the area in which the major symbols could be established. As the discussion proceeded it seemed clear that we would only confuse ourselves and our students if we tried to introduce the riddles of other cultures at the very beginning. It was best the begin with the student in Lawrence, Kansas, not by letting him see the local Chamber of Commerce films, but by sending him out, perhaps with a camera, a still camera or a motion picture camera, to study and examine what he believed to be the most salient characteristics of the life around him...

At this point this informal memo must end: my notes become a chaos of books, films, and projects which we all jotted down even as they went up on the blackboard. As the morning came to an end it was clear that this material could be shaped into a course on the basis of the general ideas which we had developed during the two previous days; the best record of this part of our discussions, then, will be the course itself.

John Ratté

THE LAWRENCE HIGH SCHOOL HUMANITIES WORKSHOP - September 23-25

The LHS Humanities workshop included the four NHF members, a team of eight LHS faculty members, and approximately ten more Lawrence teachers and administrators who were in and out during the three-day session.

In an always informal setting, the combined teams brain-stormed, explored many possible themes and teaching methods, and organized ideas. It was an experience in group dynamics. The NHF team served as thought organizers, resource people, and catalysts activating LHS team members.

Time was also allotted to a rap session with students, introducing the NHF team to the KU campus and Lawrence, and meeting with Kansas University humanities faculty members.

With the marvelous and generous help of Charles Muscatine, John Ratté, Paul Haack, and Jim Enyeart, our LHS humanities team accomplished the following:

> A rationale was developed for a humanities course at LHS. We felt it was important to satisfy the needs of secondary students whose schooling too often has been characterized by fragmentation and alienation. One objective of this course will be for the student to understand contemporary values by examining values of his culture, other cultures, and their interrelation.
>
> A skeletal outline was developed for a new course to begin next semester. In developing this outline we reached agreement on some basic philosophic questions concerning the course. For example, the course will be student-oriented and based upon student inquiry. (We will begin with our students' world, i.e., Lawrence, Kansas, 1972, and move from there in a conceptual framework.)

Staff Impressions

We all felt that as high school teachers, we are seldom freed from the mechanics of operating a classroom whereby we can realize our own potential for teaching, especially in relation to others on the staff and in areas of mutual interest. The meeting with our consultants provided this opportunity. So many factors, criss-crossing, set the tone of the meetings, that the result was a highly participative, integrative, planning endeavor. It was a "first of its kind" for some of us. The flexibility and rate of change resulting from it established a strong pattern which will remain part of our process during our next staff planning sessions. This is important since we are faced with lack of time within the regular school day for planning as a team.

The rap session with students was a catalyst in the whole process, a way of coming to grips with reactions, some of which were unexpected. Throughout the entire three days the need expressed by these students remained persistent: "What are the values of different cultures and which are real and which are fake?"

The group was cohesive and productive far beyond our hopes. The excitement from these meetings generated enthusiasm among those students who were involved in this session toward our forthcoming humanities program and has created a strong team feeling among staff members involved in the planning.

Miscellaneous impressions: ... the most stimulating and exciting intellectual experience which I have participated in since joining the LHS staff ... If the other teams are as dynamic as ours, the NHF planning grants will be invaluable to other schools ... I hope the course will prove as exciting an experience for the students as the workshop was for the teachers ... As a Monday morning quarterback, "the team could not have played better" ... Our consultants must have been unusual in their efforts to work with us, for they provided supportive measures as well as concrete ideas ... Along with the coffee and tape recorder, a most important physical item was the blackboard upon which most verbalized thoughts were written (it became our power symbol!) ... As we worked together, many of us for the first time developed a sensitivity for individual members of our team and their various fields of endeavor.

Objectives

I. Now that we have experienced the process of team work we can see the urgency of regularly scheduled planning time. Our first objective is to secure this time at once for the specified persons who will be the core team of the course.

II. We need to assess and evaluate our present resources. And determine what resources are available, what need to be acquired, what facilities are available, and what requests can be met by resource persons.

III. The basic philosophy of the course has been established. Our third objective is to start the content planning immediately with specified personnel in order that responsibilities can be allocated, obligations assumed, and an operational structure set up.

Helen Shumway

Karen Clark

Eleanor Lockhart

Larry Williams